

antipathy of the English people against the
 Irish race.
 'These were the men who were to hold England
 down by
 main force while her civil and ecclesiastical
 constitution
 was destroyed. The blood of the whole nation
 boiled at the
 thought/ ^x When the officers of an English
 regiment re-
 fused to obey the order to admit Irish recruits,
 and were
 cashiered by a court martial for their
 disobedience, ' the
 whole nation applauded the disgraced officers/
²

At this crisis the invasion of William of
 Orange took
 place. A number of colonels and other officers
 deserted to
 William. Few soldiers followed them, but their
 action was
 fatal to discipline. ' That prompt obedience
 without which
 an army is merely a rabble was necessarily at
 an end/ ³
 The material strength of the army was little
 diminished,
 but its moral strength had been destroyed.
 Unable to
 fight, James withdrew his army as William
 advanced, and
 finally ordered it to disband, and fled from
 England.

Macaulay narrates these events, and
 condemns the
 treachery of certain individual officers, but
 does not
 examine the question whether the policy of
 James justified
 the refusal of the officers to obey him. Yet that
 was a
 question which every officer in the army must
 have been
 obliged to ask himself. The great difference
 between the
 politics of the seventeenth century and those
 of the next

age is that Englishmen, whether citizens or soldiers, were continually debating whether it was right to resist their government by arms, and if so, when. For nearly a century the controversy about right of resistance or the duty of passive obedience filled pamphlets, sermons, and constitutional treatises. It was a practical, not a theoretical, problem. Macaulay discusses it at length, and shows that

¹ III, 1068-9 (ix).

² III, 1071-2 (ix).

³ III, 1150 (ix).